







# The Review.

FOUNDED, EDITED, AND PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR PREUSS.

VOL. XI.

ST. LOUIS, MO., MAY 5, 1904.

No. 18.

## WAS GEORGE WASHINGTON AN IMMORAL MAN?



STORIES of George Washington's immorality have been bandied about in clubs and on street corners for eke these many years; a well-known preacher has vouched for their truth, and a United States senator has given further currency to them by claiming special knowledge on the subject.

THE REVIEW has repeatedly been asked what evidence there is for these stories, and whether the pretended "letters" which are frequently cited have any real existence.

In 1776 a small pamphlet was printed in London, entitled 'Minutes of the Trial and Examination of Certain Persons in the Province of New York,' purporting to be the records of the examination of the conspirators of the "Hickey plot" (to murder Washington) before a committee of the Provincial Congress of New York. The manuscript was claimed in the preface to have been "discovered (on the late capture of New York by the British troops) among the papers of a person who appears to have been secretary of the committee." As part of the evidence there were printed sworn statements by "William Cooper, soldier," and "William Savage," which charged Washington with keeping as a mistress a certain Mary Gibbons, whom he often visited late at night in disguise.

There can hardly be any doubt that this pamphlet is a "clumsy Tory forgery, put forward with the same idle story of 'captured papers' employed in the 'spurious letters' of Washington, and sent forth from the same press (J. Bew) from which that forgery and several others issued."

We have condensed the above account of the origin of these charges from the latest life of the General, Paul Leicester Ford's 'The True George Washington' (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott



Co., 1902.) The same writer, who devotes an entire chapter to his subject's "Relations with the Fair Sex," is also our authority for the following :

The source from which the English pamphleteer drew this scandal is a letter to Washington from his friend Benjamin Harrison, intercepted in 1775 by the British and at once printed broadcast in the newspapers. In this the writer gossips to Washington "to amuse you and unbend your mind from the cares of war," as follows : "As I was in the pleasing task of writing to you, a little noise occasioned me to turn my head around, and who should appear but pretty little Kate, the washer-woman's daughter over the way, clean, trim and rosy as the morning. I snatched the golden, glorious opportunity, and, but for the cursed antidote to love, Sukey, I had fitted her for my general against his return. We were obliged to part, but not till we had contrived to meet again : if she keeps the appointment, I shall relish a week's longer stay." From this, thinks Mr. Ford, originated the stories of Washington's infidelity as given above, and also the coarser version of the same printed in 1776 in a Tory farce entitled 'The Battle of Brooklyn.'

But there appears to have been another and better foundation for these stories in the man's character. Mr. Ford, it is true, though he dwells frankly on all the foibles of the "Father of His Country" and considerably modifies the heroicity of the man as he is depicted by his other biographers, is very positive in declaring him innocent of the ugly charge of marital infidelity. Among others he quotes Jonathan Boucher, who knew Washington well before the Revolution, yet, as a Loyalist, wrote in no friendly spirit of him, as saying that "in his moral character he is regular." He also cites Joseph Reed, who knew the General intimately, as bearing testimony to his moral worth and purity (p. 108). Nevertheless, he is constrained to admit that "Washington during the whole of his life had a soft heart for women, and especially for good-looking ones, and both in his personal intercourse and in his letters" "shows himself very much more at ease with them than in his relations with his own sex" (p. 84). He furthermore says that "Washington was too much of a man (*sic!*) . . . to have his marriage lessen his liking for other women" (p. 108), that he always remained "open to beauty and flattery," and that "after experience (he) concluded that 'I never again will have two women in my house when I am there myself.' "

So it seems that, while the specific charges of immorality brought against Washington can not be substantiated, his character was not such as to enable his admirers to defend him against these accusations *a priori* and on general principles.

Ford is the only one of Washington's biographers, to our knowledge, who adverts to these charges expressly; if, besides what we have quoted, there is any other printed literature accessible on the subject, we should be pleased to have our attention called to it.



## A GERMAN VIEW OF THE SITUATION IN FRANCE.

Bishop Conrad Martin of Paderborn once said: "France is the country for whose possession heaven and hell contend." The religious situation in France is still puzzling the world. Various reasons are given to account for the anomalous state of affairs in a country which is considered Catholic. We have already printed a variety of views, to which we add to-day that of an able German writer in the *Frankfurter Zeitgemässe Broschüren* of Dec. 15th, 1903. The following is a summary of his paper, kindly prepared for THE REVIEW by Rev. E. Prünste of Cape Girardeau, Mo.:

Following the old adage, that a nation is largely what its history has made it, the author briefly reviews the historical development of the relation between Church and State as it is conceived by the masses of the people and practically carried out by the powers that are at the helm. The State came to be regarded as the powerful and benevolent guardian of all affairs. Its measures are designed, so the people think, for the weal of the nation, and it is unwise, or unprofitable to say the least, to stand in the way of their success. As children have unlimited confidence in the wisdom and good will of their parents, so the citizens of a country must bow in respectful silence to the will and wisdom of the dominant political powers. The people can hardly be made to understand that, at times, it may become right and proper for them to think and act otherwise.

After the fall of the Napoleonic Empire, President Thiers shrewdly used the great power conferred upon him by the National Convention to defeat the efforts of the Royalists for the restoration of the monarchy, and to break up their union. President MacMahon was too much of a Bonapartist to promote the interests of the Bourbons. Under President Grevy the Republicans began to take revenge on the Catholics for their lack of courage and foresight in carrying out their plans. In his notorious speech at Belleville, Gambetta issued the watchword: "Le Cléricalisme, voilà l'ennemi," and held out to the workingmen as a bait the "1200 millions of the Congregations." Thereupon the anti-ecclesiastical legislation was inaugurated.

During the lifetime of Count Chambord the Monarchists formed a close and law-abiding alliance. Together with the Bonapartists,



they constituted the conservative party, the Right, in the Chamber of Deputies. These three groups united in the defense of the rights of the Church and on school questions, and were vehemently opposed by the Republicans, the Left, who decried them as clericals and enemies of the Republic.

After the death of Chambord, the influence of the Catholics ceased for lack of a uniform, well-regulated, and law-respecting course of action. The adherence of Catholics to Boulanger, after he had been deserted by the Republicans, brought fresh persecution on the former, who were blamed for the entire confusion. Pope Leo XIII., contrary to previous instructions, admonished the Catholics to join forces with the Republic. As he did this at the formal request of President Grevy, he had the twofold purpose of protecting the Catholics and of striking at the root of Gallicanism, which prohibited papal interference in politics, and even in ecclesiastical affairs placed the authority of the monarch over that of the Pope. The frantic persecution of Captain Dreyfus still more weakened the position of Catholics. With even greater acrimony the hue and cry of enmity to the State was raised. Opposition to the Church is the bond that unites the Republicans. On the other hand, the fear of being regarded as clericals is the baneful weakness of the Catholics. For this reason mainly they formed no party of their own, but acted as servants and tools of other parties. They do not understand, like the German Catholics, to fight their battles for religious liberties on the basis of the constitution. The people, therefore, do not know what a Catholic party is, and hear only the recriminations of its enemies. Especially since the time of Francis I., the French have been accustomed to the belief that in politics everything is allowable. Thus even men otherwise honest had recourse to the Boulanger and Dreyfus turmoil to rid themselves of an intolerable government. Party rule is supreme, and the well-minded look in vain for a common rallying point. The fatal question about the form of government engrosses all attention and blights all efforts at reform.

The religious indifference prevailing in many parts of France has diverse causes. The bad example given by men in high station, the press, the stage, light and frivolous literature, love of pleasure, and the customary disregard of the Sunday, are not the only causes. Two others must especially be mentioned, since their influence is little known outside of France: Jansenism, which by its rigor has done well-nigh irreparable damage to religion, and a shackled clergy. The influence on the nomination of bishops granted by the Concordat to the head of the State, does not always result to the advantage of the Church. Furthermore,

the bishops are prohibited from meeting and consulting together. Their pointed protest in favor of the religious, in the beginning of 1903, had to be arranged by correspondence. But as the government scrupulously watches their correspondence, the authors of the remonstrance were found out and immediately punished by withdrawal of their legal salary. The income of the parish priest is very meagre. If they in any way become offensive to political understrappers, they are, frequently without a warning, made to feel their vengeance. The parishes are not permitted to acquire or to possess any property. The law requires them to charge pew-rent and high fees for weddings and funerals to defray their expenses. This measure is maliciously exploited against the Church and grievously injures religion. The ways and means of suppression are manifold.

The decrease in the birth rate is mainly owing to social conditions brought about by the Code Napoleon. The privileges which this code concedes to children, makes them adversaries of their parents. The anti-ecclesiastical principles upon which it is based, are disguised to blind the people. The code recognizes no right of affiliation. All associations, without exception, are merely tolerated, and may be dissolved at any moment. Individualism, which is such a marked trait of the French character and which the governmental legislation tends to encourage, is in itself antagonistic to every form of association.

By their relations with the government, the banks, press, professional politicians, Freemasons (25,000-50,000), Protestants (about 100,000), and Jews (72,000) exercise greater influence on matters and events than their number warrants. They always go with the government, with the dominant and strongest party. On the other hand, the Catholics, since the resignation of MacMahon (1878), are always in opposition to the government, and that never under their own, but under a strange and unsympathetic banner. The hope for religion in France is a strong Catholic party, based upon and governed by an intelligent social program.



## IS THE SINGLE TAX THEORY AN OPEN QUESTION?

### IV.

HENRY GEORGE AND LEO XIII.

We have seen Henry George's exposition of the Single Tax theory and the teaching of Leo XIII. on individual land ownership. Let us now compare them.

Henry George expresses himself with unmistakable clearness. What can be clearer and farther from ambiguity than, e. g., his



condemnation of individual land ownership in the chapter headed: "The Injustice of Private Property in Land"? (Progress and Poverty, bk. vii, ch. I.) He speaks, moreover, with the emphasis and assurance of one who does not entertain the least doubt about his having at last discovered the long-desired remedy against the social evils of mankind, and never wearies of repeating his denunciations of "the cause of all social evils," as well as his recommendations of the sovereign remedy, the Single Tax.

Leo XIII. too speaks with unmistakable clearness and with a force to which no translation can do justice. In lucidity, accuracy, and power of expression the part of the Encyclical "*Rerum Novarum*" which we have considered, is a real masterpiece.

As regards the teachings of our Agrarian Socialist and the Pontiff, we can without danger of contradiction point out at least this feature of similarity: both bear the stamp of remarkable simplicity and consistency. Individual land ownership is unjust; hence we must make land common property. The best way of doing this is to collect the land rent in the form of a tax, in lieu of all other taxes; hence we must introduce the Single Tax. Is this not very simple? And is it not also most consistent? Undoubtedly, if the State owns all the land, it is but just that those who possess and use for their own benefit a portion of that land, should pay the State the respective land rent. The doctrine of the Pope, on the other hand, is no less simple and consistent: The right of holding private property in land is given to man by nature; hence private property in land is to be kept inviolate.

But simplicity and consistency are the only common features of the two doctrines. In all other respects the teaching of Henry George and that of Leo XIII. are diametrically opposed to one another.

We need not give further proof for this statement. Nevertheless, it will be interesting and instructive to see the opposition more in detail. Let us review some striking assertions which occur in the VII. book of 'Progress and Poverty,' headed: "The Justice of the Remedy," and contrast with them the corresponding utterances of the Pontiff.

Henry George writes: "To affirm the rightfulness of property in land, is to affirm a claim which has no warrant in nature....." (p. 242.) "Whatever may be said for the institution of private property in land, it is plain that it can not be defended on the score of justice" (p. 243). "The recognition of individual proprietorship of land is the denial of the natural rights of other individuals—it is a wrong which must show itself in the inequitable division of wealth" (p. 245).

The Pope writes: "*Coemptus opifici fundus tam est in ejus*



potestate futurum quam parva labore merces." If a laborer with his earnings buys some real estate, the latter will be in his power just as was the money with which he bought it. Of course, the Pope supposes that the laborer does not buy the land from one who acquired it unjustly and therefore is not its owner, but from one who really owns it, and therefore can also sell it. Such transaction then, according to the Pontiff, creates real proprietorship in land.

"Remedium proponunt cum iustitia aperte pugnans, quia possidere res privatim ut suas, just est homini a natura datum." The remedy which Agrarian Socialists propose, viz. the nationalization of the soil, is manifestly repugnant to justice, because the right of having private property (in land as well as in chattels) has been given to man by nature.

"In homine esse non modo terrenorum fructuum, sed ipsius terrae dominatum oportet. . . . Rem quamdam debet homini natura dedisse stabilem perpetuoque mansuram, unde perennitas subsidii expectari possit. Atqui istiusmodi perennitatem nulla res praestare, nisi cum ubertatibus suis terra, potest." Man can have the ownership not only of the fruits of the earth, but also of the land itself. Nature owes to man for his ever-recurring needs a never-failing store-house, and this is nothing else but the earth with its abundance and fertility.

Henry George says: "The Almighty, who created the earth for man and man for the earth, has entailed it upon all the generations of the children of men by a decree written upon the constitution of all things—a decree which no human action can bar and no prescription determine. Let the parchments be ever so many, or possession ever so long, natural justice can recognize no right in one man to the possession and enjoyment of land that is not equally the right of all his fellows" (p. 244).

The Pontiff declares: "Deus generi hominum donavisse terram in commune dicitur, non quod ejus promiscuum apud omnes dominatum voluerit, sed quia partem nullam cuique assignavit possidendam." Accordingly, God did not give to mankind at large the common ownership of the earth (promiscuum apud omnes dominatum); in creating "the earth for man and man for the earth," the Almighty has not "entailed it" as their common property "upon all the generations of the children of men," but destined it for the benefit of all, without however assigning any particular portion of the earth to any particular person as its owner, leaving the appropriation of particular portions to men's activity and to the laws of peoples. According to the Pontiff, therefore, the earth or the soil is by nature and originally neither owned by mankind, nor by any individual, but is ownerless, "res nullius," as

the school-men say ; being "*res nullius*," actually "ownerless," yet destined to become the property of somebody—for man, generally speaking, needs private property,—it may be appropriated or acquired as property by any one. The appropriation of ownerless objects takes place by "occupancy," which, according to sound philosophy, is the primitive title of ownership and derives its validity from natural right. "*Res nullius fit primi occupantis*."

Henry George thus forestalls an objection :

"But it will be said : There are improvements which in time become indistinguishable from the land itself. Very well ; then the title to the improvements becomes blended with the title to the land ; the individual right is lost in the common right. It is the greater that swallows up the less, not the less that swallows up the greater. Nature does not proceed from man, but man from nature, and it is into the bosom of nature that he and all his works must return again."

Besides, "there is no difficulty in determining where the individual right ends and the common right begins. . . . . The value of land expresses in exact and tangible form the right of the community in land held by an individual ; and rent expresses the exact amount which the individual should pay to the community to satisfy the equal rights of all other members of the community."

"As for the deduction of a complete and exclusive individual right to land from priority of occupation, that is, if possible, the most absurd ground on which land ownership can be defended" (pp. 246 sq.)

Leo XIII. teaches : "*Cum in parandis naturae bonis industriam mentis viresque corporis homo insumat, hoc ipso applicat ad sese eam naturae corporeae partem, quam ipse percoluit. . . .*" He who cultivates some landed estate—of course not one that belongs to his neighbor or to anybody else, but one that belongs to nobody, that is ownerless, "*res nullius*"—by cultivating it makes it his own, cultivation necessarily implying occupation. The same would hold in the case of one who would build, not on an estate that has an owner, but on ownerless ground : his building on it evidently would imply occupation and consequently make it his own.

"*Quod cum negant, fraudatum iri partis suo labore rebus hominem non vident. . . . Quibus rebus (ager) est melior factus, illae sic solo inhaerent miscenturque penitus, ut maximam partem nullo pacto sint separabiles a solo.*" The improvements of the soil can not for the greatest part be actually separated any more from the soil ; they have become identified with the soil. Hence the free disposal of the soil actually implies the free disposal of the improvements, and vice versa. The moral power of freely



disposing of an object constitutes the right of ownership or dominion. Denying, therefore, to the cultivator or builder in the above-mentioned cases the disposal, i. e., the dominion, of the soil, is in fact denying the disposal or dominion of the improvements which are the very fruits of his exertion. "Atqui id quemquam potiri illoque perfrui, in qua alius desudavit, utrumne justitia patiatur? Quo modo effectae res causam sequuntur, a qua effectae sunt, sic operae fructum ad eos ipsos qui operam dederint, rectum est pertinere."

Henry George affirms: "The truth is, and from this truth there can be no escape, that there is and can be no just title to an exclusive possession of the soil, and that private property in land is a bold, bare, enormous wrong, like that of chattel slavery.

"The majority of men in civilized communities do not recognize this, simply because the majority of men do not think. With them whatever is, is right, until its wrongfulness has been frequently pointed out, and in general they are ready to crucify whoever first attempts this.

"But it is impossible for any one to study political economy, even as at present taught, or to think at all upon the production and distribution of wealth, without seeing that property in land differs essentially from property in things of human production, and that it has no warrant in abstract justice" (pp. 257 sq.)

Leo XIII. denies the essential difference between "property in land and property in things of human production." He declares the one as well as the other to be derived from nature and warranted by justice. To deny and abolish the right of property, either in land and chattels or in land alone, is, according to the Pontiff, a "manifest wrong." The arguments, moreover, for the rightfulness and necessity of individual land ownership, are, as he expressly states, so clear that he is amazed at finding the Agrarian Socialists grant to individuals the ownership of the fruits of the earth, but not that of the land itself. He approvingly mentions in behalf of individual land ownership not only the conviction of all ages and the just laws of commonwealths, but also the authority of the divine law. Finally, he lays it down as an essential basis for all true social reform, that "private possessions" must be kept inviolate.

"Si tenuitate sumptuum quicquam ipse (opifex) comparsit fructumque parsimoniae suae, quo tutior esse custodia possit, in praedio collocavit, profecto praedium istiusmodi nihil est aliud, quam merces ipsa aliam induta speciem: proptereaque coemptus sic opifici fundus tam est in ejus potestate futurus, quam parta labore merces. Sed in hoc plane, ut facile intelligitur, rerum dominium vel moventium vel solidarum consistit."

"Remedium proponunt cum iustitia aperte pugnans, quia possidere res privatim ut suas, jus est homini a natura datum. . . . Bona homini tribuere necesse est non utenda solum, . . . sed stabili perpetuoque jure possidenda, neque ea dumtaxat quae usu consumuntur, sed etiam ea quae nobis utentibus, permanent. . . . In homine esse non modo terrenarum fructuum, sed ipsius terrae dominatum oportet."

"Horum tam perspicua vis est argumentorum, ut mirabile videatur, dissentire quosdam exoletarum opinionum restitutores: qui usum quidem soli, variosque praediorum fructus homini privato concedunt: at possideri ab eo ut domino vel solum, in quo aedificavit, vel praedium, quod excoluit, plane jus esse negant. Quod cum negant, fraudatum iri partis suo labore rebus hominem non vident."

"Merito igitur universitas generis humani. . . . in ipsius lege naturae fundamentum reperit partitionis bonorum, possessionesque privatas, ut quae cum hominum natura pacatoque et tranquillo convictu maxime congruant, omnium saeculorum usu consecravit. Leges autem civiles. . . . id jus, de quo loquimur, confirmant ac vi etiam adhibenda tuentur. Idem divinarum legum sanxit auctoritas, quae vel appetere alienum gravissime vetant."

"Maneat ergo, cum plebi sublevatio quaeritur, hoc in primis haberi fundamenti instar oportere, privatas possessiones inviolatas servandas."

(*To be continued.*)



## BOOK REVIEWS AND LITERARY NOTES.

*Horae Diurnae.* 18mo. 1904. Pustet & Co.

Many a priest whose eyesight has grown dim, uses the large quarto edition of the Breviary for the Matins and Lauds, but finds it rather unwieldy for the Little Hours, etc., and would like to have a handy *Horae Diurnae* with large print and containing everything as much as possible in its proper place. The Mechlin edition of 1903 is very handy and well printed, but the publisher's chief aim seems to have been to save space and paper and labor. The reader is continuously referred to some other page, where he may find what he needs. Not so in this Pustet edition. All things are in their proper place, without references, except such as are unavoidable. Moreover, there is a more substantial India paper in the Pustet than in the Mechlin edition, though the volume is scarcely a quarter of an inch thicker.

The only desideratum in the Pustet edition concerns the fly-



leaves which contain the psalms for the Lauds, Little Hours, etc. They should have a heading like the *Horae Diurnae* or *Breviary*, indicating to what part of the office they belong.

*Answers to Objections Against the Catholic Religion.* By Msgr. de Ségur. 16mo., 258 pages. Society of the Divine Word, Shermerville, Ill. Price 25c.

This handy booklet contains answers to fifty-three objections frequently raised against our holy religion by infidels or indifferent Catholics. It can hardly be expected that these answers should convince infidels, but they may do immense good to indifferent Catholics by awakening the faith that is dormant in them, and much more good to practical Catholics, who may have to answer current objections, by not only furnishing them with a ready armory, but also confirming their own faith. Hence we should like to see this English edition of Msgr. de Ségur's work find a home in every Catholic family. Paper and binding are good, better than in any other work hitherto offered on the Catholic book market for 25c; but greater typographical accuracy, a more idiomatic English diction, and more artistic illustrations would greatly increase its value.

*Newman.* By William Barry. Illustrated. New York: Scribner's Sons: 1904. Price, net \$1.

This is one of the 'Literary Lives,' edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. It considers the great Cardinal chiefly from the literary point of view: as an English classic. Dr. Barry is an incisive writer, though not always reliable in his statement of facts, and tinged with Liberalism. For him who knows the story of Cardinal Newman and of the epoch in the formation of which he was such an important factor, this book will prove interesting and suggestive reading; but, like Purcell's biography of Manning, we would not put it into the hands of the tyro. A valuable feature of the volume are the portraits of Newman, of which there are thirteen, representing him at different periods of his life.



—Pustet & Co., of New York, sent us fasciculi 1 to 12 of their new periodical published in Rome: *Acta Pontificia et Decreta SS. RR. Congregationum*. It appears monthly, and the subscription price for foreigners is five francs. The object of the publication is sufficiently explained in its title. The numbers before us are well edited and a real help to all who wish to keep *au courant* of important decisions of the Holy See and the Roman Congregations.



## MINOR TOPICS.

---

*Our Status in Church Music.*—The last two or three numbers of the *Ecclesiastical Review* contain a scathing paper by Professor W. E. P. Stockley, of Halifax, N. S., on the present condition of Catholic church choirs in the United States and English Canada. A clergyman writing in the *Catholic Columbian* (xxix, 16) rightly says that this paper "is about as true a picture of Catholic degeneracy in church music as could be prudently and conveniently published;" but that there are worse abuses than those mentioned by Professor Stockley; and if he could relate without fear of scandalizing, many incidents of his own experience, he would surpass him in illustrating the depth of decadence into which we have fallen.

He (the clergyman in the *Columbian*) proceeds to summarize our present status in church music as follows:

"First—The serious and practical study of Gregorian music has been in the past, and is still.... a most woeful deficiency in our seminaries; and where it is taught, it is relegated to the background, and looked upon as a very secondary and unimportant branch of ecclesiastical study. As a necessary and fatal consequence, very few of our priests possess either taste or knowledge for the old and time-honored liturgical chant of the Church. Either they are totally ignorant of it, or their knowledge is of the most superficial kind, barely enabling them to sing the high Mass creditably. This being the condition of things among the shepherds, who can wonder that Gregorian music is a land unknown to the flock?"

"Second—A badly vitiated musical taste in the selection of the figured music usually heard in our churches, seems to prevail almost everywhere. Every known light and fantastic operatic aria has received a Latin coat, and has been published as a Mass solo, as an 'O Salutaris,' an 'Ave Maria,' and what not, and is heard during the most solemn and devotional parts of our holy services. The performances of our choirs have been silently and tacitly separated from the celebration of the Mass and the sermon, which in all the newspaper reports of our church services are scarcely mentioned except as adjuncts to the musical prowess of our solo singers.

"Third—There is a false idea current among many that a so-called fine, modern choir draws the worshipers to our churches, and that with an old-fashioned Gregorian choir our pews would be empty during high Mass. This, in my estimation, is the worst prevarication of all. It has a clear tendency to confirm non-Catholics in their ignorant prejudices against our form of worship, which, according to many of them, is looked upon as merely spectacular and musical. To go to a Catholic church where a fine choir holds forth in the organ loft, is to many of them an excellent musical treat and distraction."

And in consequence of all this we now find ourselves in a quandary:

"We have been most wonderfully blinded and deluded, and now



that our Holy Father calls us to the reality of things, we find ourselves, through our past neglect, in bad straits, when we think of the necessity of obeying the supreme head of the Church. We know that, with the exception of a few institutions, the Gregorian chant is an art completely lost. In the majority of our parishes we could find neither teachers nor singers nor organists for a Gregorian choir. Our school teachers are certainly in the same condition, and everywhere priests are asking themselves: Where shall I procure the first stone for the rebuilding of an edifice which has been utterly demolished and has disappeared years ago?"

The writer answers the query by an appeal for a radical reform: "The prospect for introducing Gregorian choirs may be dark and discouraging, but with general good will the reform is not impossible. I sincerely believe, however, that in our case a radical remedy is the only cure for a radical evil, and I have but little faith in the efficiency of a compromise attempt at reform, consisting of eliminating from our catalog of flimsy church music, the most fantastic and objectionable features. I entertain very serious doubts whether much has been accomplished in that direction by so-called diocesan commissions. Half measures rarely succeed in any serious enterprise. Let us suppose that an authoritative mandate is issued simultaneously by our bishops, that after a certain fixed date all mixed choirs must cease to sing in our churches, and that none but Gregorian music must be used;—I admit that in all probability one-half of our churches could not celebrate a high Mass. But even this drawback need not be exaggerated from a musical standpoint. Some might complain, but the radical prohibition would certainly act as a most powerful stimulus upon all. I am convinced that, necessity driving, we would soon find a way to introduce once more the only music which is adapted to our noble liturgy and time-honored church ceremonies."

Thus far the writer in the *Columbian*.

We learn that the question came up before our archbishops at their late conference in Washington, and that they resolved to have Cardinal Gibbons send a statement of the church music situation to Rome, with a request to modify some of the more severe rulings of the *Motu proprio* for the United States.

**Card Parties for Church and Charitable Purposes.**—There is another side to this subject, and it is brought out as follows in a letter addressed to THE REVIEW by the pastor of a parish in one of the smaller cities of the State of New York. He writes:

"Your comment (No. 14) on the complaints of *La Vérité* of Quebec, in regard to euchre parties for church and charitable purposes, is undoubtedly timely and well-meant, but let me kindly remark: In the first place, if nothing worse than such schemes for raising money for charitable purposes, would happen in this blessed country of ours, there might be less remorse of conscience in high places. *La Vérité* ought to make a better study of our conditions. In Canada the parishes, according to European style, are mostly provided with certain funds, by which general church expenses are covered. With us it is not so; our resources are pew rent, Sunday and extra collections, etc., 'any old thing to make

money.' Many of our young people can not be induced to pay for sittings in church, and our sixth church commandment does not draw them. How then will a poor priest meet his expenses, with heavy cathedraticum and seminary assessments, besides many other diocesan collections, increasing every year? The writer of these lines has, for the last eight years, sacrificed over \$25 of his own salary in order to defray church and school expenses, and yet has been unable to reduce the mortgage on his church property. True enough, no divine blessing can be expected from such money-raising, but we would thank *La Vérité* very much for a practical suggestion of raising money in other ways. To tolerate such things is simply a *dirum necessarium* in many cases. Nearly all the bishops in the United States are opposed to such proceedings, and many a conscientious pastor worries about it; but the cash has to be forthcoming all the same, and when the finances of a church are not in the best shape at the death of its pastor, he is whipped over his shoulders for not being a financier, though he might have been a priest with excellent virtues. Many poor sectarian aggregations are supported by the better favored ones, but the poor Catholic missions have to look out for themselves."

**A Catholic Congress?**—There is some talk of holding a Catholic Congress at the St. Louis Fair. The *Catholic Transcript* (vi, 45) comments thereon as follows: "A Congress of Catholics which would really represent the wise and constructive forces at work in the Church, would no doubt prove measurably advantageous to the Catholic cause. But we doubt very much the possibility of mustering such an assembly. A marshaling of the regulars or professionals would prove of questionable utility. The old regulation resolutions, high-sounding and voluminous, have become weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable. The declaimer with Bible in one hand and constitution in the other, has likewise become monotonous and absurd. Let him charter his trains at his own expense, let him hire his own halls and exercise his own magnetic powers in attracting an audience. The Catholic public can stand an occasional *gaudeamus* of this kind."

In view of the proceedings and results of the Baltimore and Chicago congresses, we fear many will assent to this view.

—The Report of the Director of the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions for 1903-4 is the fullest and, in a sense, the most satisfactory ever issued. It shows that interest in the Catholic Indian missions is growing. By proper proceedings with government officials, several crying wrongs have been righted; while others are in the way of adjustment. To us the most interesting part is the symposium of letters from missionaries and other workers among the Indians, unanimously emphasizing the necessity of separate Catholic schools for the Indian children, because an hour or two of religious instruction per week is not enough to keep the faith alive in an atmosphere that is indifferent, if not hostile to religion. While it proves clearly the necessity of more help for establishing and maintaining Catholic schools among the Indians, it is also a powerful argument against the advocates, for our children in general, of public schools with a sprinkling of religion before or after class hours.



Fr. Ketcham, the zealous Director of the Bureau, has also made an attempt to gather some reliable statistics of our Catholic Indians, but failed, because not properly assisted by the heads of those dioceses in which there are Indians, in spite of a courteous recommendation of his request by Cardinal Gibbons. Curious to observe, the Cardinal's own Archdiocese of Baltimore is one of those that neglected to send in a report.

—The Kansas Supreme Court has rendered a decision regarding Bible reading in the public schools, which seems to require some explanation. A boy had been suspended from school, because on the advice of his father's attorney he had absented himself from the morning "exercises" (read : Bible lesson.) His father sued the Board of Education for reinstatement of his son, and was refused by the District Court, whose judgment was affirmed by the Supreme Court with this declaration :

"A public school teacher who, for the purpose of quieting the pupils and preparing them for their regular studies, repeats the Lord's Prayer and the Twenty-third Psalm as a morning exercise without comment or remark, *in which none of the pupils are required to participate*, is not conducting a religious doctrine." (Italics ours)

If "none of the pupils are required to participate," why was the boy suspended? and why is he not reinstated?

—It is refreshing to note that the President of the National Fraternal Congress, a union of fraternal societies formed for the purpose of putting mutual life insurance upon a safer basis, is strongly opposed to so-called "patriotic" organizations, whose stock-in-trade is "anti-Catholic" and "patriotic." In a letter, dated Flint, Mich., April 16th, addressed to the officers and members, this gentleman, Mr. Edwin O. Wood, says : "The use of the word 'patriotic' in connection with antagonism to the great Catholic Church is a libel upon patriotism and a counterfeit use of the word. Two members of the United States Supreme Court are Roman Catholics, and many of the leading patriotic American statesmen as well as millions of the most representative and loyal citizens of this country are active, practical, and consistent Catholics." The question arose in regard to a bill before the Ohio State Senate, in which the Junior Order of American Mechanics took a hand.

—The *C. M. B. A. News* recently printed a letter from Bishop Shanahan in praise of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association and its new basis of rates. The letter was headed : "Bishop's Residence, Harrisburg, Pa." (no date) and addressed to the "Editor *C. M. B. A. News*." The *Catholic Union and Times* reproduced it in its No. 3. The Bishop informs us that he believes he wrote something like the contents of this letter to a friend in Philadelphia, but that he has "never written to the Editor of the *C. M. B. A. News*. There is no 'Bishop's Residence' in Harrisburg." It does not, somehow, look right to us to change the superscription on, and twist a bishop's private letter into an official approbation.

—Rt. Rev. Bishop O'Gorman, of Sioux Falls, S. D., informs us in reply to an enquiry, that the report recently spread by the



Minneapolis *Journal*, the Milwaukee *Catholic Citizen*, and other newspapers, that "there is a movement on foot looking to the creation of an archiepiscopal see in South Dakota, with Bishop O'Gorman of Sioux Falls as Archbishop of Aberdeen." etc.,—is "a ridiculous piece of fiction indeed." His Lordship adds: "Twenty years hence, maybe, the Diocese of Sioux Falls may have grown in population to the extent that it will need to be divided. Just now there is no thought or possibility of such a move."

—The *Herold des Glaubens*, 19 South Broadway, St. Louis, has issued a World's Fair Guide, which will prove particularly useful to Catholic visitors and delegates to the various Catholic conventions scheduled to meet here this summer. The booklet, which can be carried in one's vest pocket, retails for ten cents a copy. It contains a map of the city, a plan of the Fair grounds, all the street-car lines, a list of churches and institutions, hotels, public buildings, etc., together with a directory of all Catholic societies and other useful information.

—One of the quotations from the encyclical *Rerum novarum* in our No. 16, p. 251, tenth line from the top, was slightly emasculated by a typographical error. The clause should have read: "Neque ea dumtaxat *quæ* usu consumuntur, sed etiam quæ nobis utentibus permanent." On page 250, line 12 from the top, the word *the* after "the Pope declares," was a manifest misprint for *that*, while, a little further up, what was intended to read "*literal*" was twisted by the printer's devil into a *liberal* translation.

—The Fall River *Indépendant*, one of the daily organs of our French-Canadian brethren in New England, says (xxxix, 17), the Catholic University at Washington ought to have a French chair, as it has a German chair. It ought to have both, but in matter of fact has neither, though a gift of \$10,000 by Rev. Fr. Walburg of Cincinnati has inspired the faculty with the hope that a chair for German language and literature will soon become a reality.

—Rt. Rev. Bishop Meerschaert, Vicar-Apostolic of Oklahoma, who paid us a pleasant call last Saturday, authorizes THE REVIEW to contradict the report that the bishops of the New Orleans province at their recent conference considered the question of creating another diocese in Texas and raising one of the present dioceses to the rank of a metropolitan see.

—Rev. Henry Tappert, of Covington, Ky., begs us to remark that, in his opinion, it would be a mistake to supply a choir with copies of any of the editions of the Solesmes chant now in the market, as an official edition is in preparation under the auspices of the Holy Father himself, which all publishers will be free to reprint.

—In our article: "Freemasonry in Washington" (No. 17, pp. 257 sq.) we committed the error of naming the State of Michigan as the donor of the famous Marquette statue, which has finally been accepted by Congress. We meant *Wisconsin*.





